UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,506	11/07/2006	Antonella Bogoni	5577-001	4215 .
24112 7590 05/11/2007 COATS & BENNETT, PLLC 1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300			EXAMINER	
			HELLNER, MARK	
Cary, NC 27518			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/571,506	BOGONI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark Hellner	3663				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
· <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction in the original transfer of the original transfer or the original transfer of the original transfer of the original transfer of the original transfer or the o	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ②6/11/10006	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te				

Application/Control Number: 10/571,506 Page 2

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 21-40 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-26 of copending Application No. 10/542,296 in view of Allan et al. Claims 14-26 of 10/542,296 recite the inventive concept of using a lasing signal in the ASE band to control gain in a WDM loop that includes EDFAs. Claims 21-40 of the present application are different for merely claiming known structure of WDM loops. This type of structure is shown by the conventional WDM loop disclosed by Allan et al

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 3663

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Page 3

Claims 21-27, 37, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al.

Lee et al disclose a WDM loop comprising: a plurality of nodes (14a to 14d) connected with a plurality of waveguides (12) to form a loop, the loop including optical amplifiers (OA) between sections of the loop.

Column 5, lines 30 to 45 teach the use of a lasing signal within the ASE band in order to control gain in the loop during a line failure.

This teaching combined with the structure of the loop broadly reads on claims 21-27, 37, 38 and 40.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references cited show the general state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

AU 3663 Mach Helling